

Original Article

# Three-Dimensional Integration: The Framework for the Generalized Reproduction of Human Society

Jia Kang

*The Chinese Academy of Fiscal Science, The Ministry of Finance of The People's Republic of China.*

Received: 06 April 2025

Revised: 11 May 2025

Accepted: 28 May 2025

Published: 20 June 2025

**Abstract** - This paper broadly summarizes the reproduction of human society as a “three-dimensional integration” cognitive framework. The first dimension involves the reproduction of material resources essential for human society’s survival, continuity, and development, accompanied by the reproduction of labor, capital, and production relations. The second dimension pertains to the inevitable reproduction of the entire human population as a social entity. The third dimension refers to the reproduction of human thoughts and culture rooted in the fundamental principles of “humanity” and “human dignity” based on humanistic logic. The integration or organic combination of these three dimensions constitutes the most fundamental issue concerning the survival and development of the “human society” as a living entity. This “three-dimensional integration” cognitive framework, in terms of its inherent logical relationships, possesses self-evident, axiomatic qualities that require no proof. However, in the previous academic discussions, a clear and comprehensive cognitive framework has not been formed domestically and internationally. The successive development of human society inherently contains the endogenous driving force of social members’ aspirations and pursuits for a better life and the proposition of supply-side innovative development as a response mechanism to this driving force. Within the generalized reproduction of the three-dimensional integration, there are still difficulties to be overcome and contradictions and conflicts to be resolved. The “humanized” progress in the coordination mechanism within the trinity framework holds perpetual value for pursuit.

**Keywords** - Three-Dimensional Integration, General Reproduction of Human Society, Reproduction of means of Materials, Reproduction of Human Species, Reproduction of thoughts and culture.

## 1. Introduction

Biologically, “human” is defined as a species of the primate family Hominidae, with the scientific name *Homo sapiens*, meaning “wise man”. In philosophical terms, humans are a group of the most advanced life forms endowed with emotional and rational thinking.

As a species of intelligent, thinking life forms that have transcended the general animal kingdom, humans have established interconnected relationships among their members, constituting the concept of “human society”, which spans from the earliest primitive groups to today’s diverse nationalities and the entirety of humankind. The evolutionary process of humans can be traced back to the “forest apes” approximately 6 million years ago. Through the lengthy, multi-group, multi-stage process of natural selection characterized by “survival of the fittest”, a lineage of humans, now widely accepted as originating in Africa about 2 million years ago (though still subject to much debate), managed to survive and perpetuate, becoming the sole extant species under the genus *Homo* — the ancestral lineage of “*Homo sapiens*”. Survival and reproduction were paramount for primitive human groups in the natural environment governed by the “law of the jungle”. Engaging in labor to obtain means of subsistence through fire and tools

constituted humanity’s initial “production” activities, forming the “productive forces” of human society. The continuous reproduction and renewal of human production processes, driven by the needs for survival, reproduction, and aspirations, constitute the reproduction process of human society.

Throughout the Paleolithic Age (approximately 2.5 million years ago to around 10,000 years ago) and the Neolithic Age (approximately 10,000 years ago to the 21<sup>st</sup> century BCE), the most significant advancements influencing the existence and continuity of human society in the annals of “human civilization history” have been the agricultural revolution approximately 10,000 years ago, the emergence of writing over 5,000 years ago, the Industrial Revolution 260 years ago, and the current tumultuous wave of the Information Revolution. Over the past 10,000 years, the acceleration of productivity improvements has become increasingly pronounced and has developed into today’s rapidly evolving era of “AI+”, when innovations are overwhelming. However, the fundamental issues of human society remain centered around the three-tiered aspirations of survival, development, and enjoyment, manifested as an unceasing interaction between human needs and the effective supply to meet those needs, as well as the



expansion of social life's richer content based on economic cycles where supply responds to demand.

Human society's survival and continuity processes are reflected in academic terms as its production and reproduction processes. The academic community's research achievements on the reproduction of human society are already vast and impressive, with Marx's theory of social reproduction as the most representative, along with Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction, Parsons' theory of social system reproduction, and it can be argued that the cognitive framework has evolved from the most basic and specific perspectives of reproduction centered on material resources, commodities, and capital reproduction to a broader and systematically integrated framework of reproduction that encompasses cultural and other dimensions.

This paper adopts a broad perspective to propose, from a systematically integrated yet concise, clear, and logically and historically coherent standpoint, a "three-dimensional integration" framework for understanding the generalized reproduction of human society. This framework integrates the reproduction of material resources, human beings themselves, and human thoughts into a unified whole — representing the reproduction of human material wealth, the human population, and human spiritual wealth, respectively, synthesizing the dynamic, ever-evolving, and uninterrupted process of integrated reproduction and evolutionary development of human society.

The following discussion elaborates on this framework.

## 2. The Reproduction of Means of Material in Human Society

The survival and sustainable development of humans in nature first requires the supply of material resources required for the survival needs of humans, namely, the provision of necessities such as food, clothing, shelter, and transportation. The activities for satisfying human survival and sustainable development needs through the supply of effective goods' use value are initially manifested as the natural division of labor among primitive human groups, with muscular males primarily engaged in hunting while females, due to physiological characteristics, more involved in gathering and child-rearing. Tools and labor division facilitated the continuous acquisition and production of valuable material resources from nature to meet basic consumption needs. This represents the initial manifestation of the "three essential elements of productivity" in human society - labor force, means of labor, and labor objects (comprising other biological resources in nature). Based on this, humans' subsequent enriching social life is conducted by first addressing the "relationship between humans and nature" to obtain the production and reproduction of material resources for survival.

The historical materialism established by Marx and Engels explains in unambiguous terms that: "men must first eat, drink, shelter and cloth themselves before they can engage in politics, science, art, religion, and so on; and so the production of the immediate material means of subsistence, and thus a certain stage of the economic development of a people or an epoch, constitutes the basis. On this basis, people's national facilities, views of law, arts, and religious conceptions develop. It must, therefore, be interpreted from this basis, rather than the other way around, as was done in the past". [1] With the reproduction of material resources to satisfy their survival needs as a prerequisite, people seek development and enjoyment. They can enter the fields of religion, art, law, politics and state activities. The social relations that inevitably form between them are, first of all, the relations of production determined by the level and stage of development of the productive forces, and then the corresponding strata and class structures, as well as the mode of social production that is jointly constituted by the productive forces and the relations of production, and the nature of the society, which stages can distinguish.

Marx pointed out that social reproduction has links to production, distribution, exchange, and consumption, which co-exist in time and succeed each other in order. He distinguished between value and use value about the intrinsic attributes of the products (commodities) that are the outputs of the reproduction of the material means in the intervening period. In *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, primarily focusing on capitalist production and capital circulation, he made a qualitative division between C, V, and M based on general forms of value, i.e., "constant capital" (C) corresponding to the means of production, "variable capital" (V) corresponding to labour force, and "surplus value" (M) representing capital accumulation. (Indeed, after the productive forces of human society have reached the stage when "surplus products" can be formed, this three-part division can be broadly adapted to all social forms.) Furthermore, he identified the conditions for realizing such social reproduction, whether it is simple reproduction maintaining the total scale of production or expanded reproduction increasing the overall scale, should be divided into two main categories: production of means of production and production of means of consumption, and then sketched out the diagram of the balanced relationship between the two categories and the basic conditions of dynamic sustainability - that is to say, the process of material substitution supported by the reproduction of the means of production, and the process of consumption, which enables the reproduction of labor force, form the "total reproduction process" in which "material compensation" and "value compensation" are "proportional" unified balance to the same process. The inherent logic of this "proportional" law in the cognitive framework can align harmoniously with the economic concept of "optimal resource allocation", a basic economic consensus that pertains to how scarce resources achieve

overall supply-demand balance and structural equilibrium, governed by the corresponding objective laws (of aggregate and structural balance). People can explore these laws to pursue optimization.

In short, Marx's theory of social reproduction, based on examining and analyzing the operational mechanisms of the entire production process in a capitalist society, outlines the unity of material reproduction, labor power reproduction, and reproduction of production relations (including surplus value production). It places particular emphasis on revealing the connotations of the reproduction of the inherent production relations ("capitalist nature") [2], which is an internal mechanism of capitalist production, indicating the historical trend of the "abandonment" of capital private ownership and revolutionary transformation of production relations determined by the laws of the development of productive forces. It should be noted that a series of fundamental principles revealed in this cognitive framework are by no means applicable solely to capitalist economies. It can be argued that all the processes of socialized reproduction are ultimately determined by the objective laws of balanced and proportional resource allocation in the production of means of production and means of subsistence and serve the effective supply formation that meets the needs of human society's survival, development, and enjoyment. [3]

However, the effects of these objective laws often manifest in real life as disproportions and operational crises, appearing in the form of abnormal economic and social fluctuations, losses, and disorders, becoming a particular way to rationalize the proportionality relationship by compulsorily opening up the way for its implementation and breaking down the obstacles with economic fluctuations and even shocks. The crises of overproduction, financial crises and strong economic and social fluctuations that have occurred many times in modern human history have also been a powerful motivation for pushing and forcing academic theories to develop and innovate to serve practice and promote humankind's well-being. There have been many research achievements on economic crises, but we will not elaborate in detail here.

Developing the future based on the progress already achieved in human society's material production, the latest developments in the era of digitalization and artificial intelligence have led to a series of major issues related to the "human destiny". While "efficiency" has been improved day by day based on the progress and improvement of "algorithms" and "computing power", how will the relationship between "human beings (labor force)" and "robots (labor tools/equipment)" evolve in the future social production and reproduction? What kind of "disruptive innovations" might the development of "brain-computer interfaces" (the combination of "carbon-based life" and "silicon-based life") bring about? ... These issues require dedicated research and discussion.

The examination from this perspective also needs to be further extended to the next, more expansive perspective: the reproduction of the human species as a whole (of which "labor force" is only one component). The reproduction of social capital and the cyclical nature of the entire material reproduction process serve and are inherently contained within the reproductive demands of the human species. The reproduction of labor force, which is indispensable in Marx's examination of capital reproduction, is inherent in the reproduction process of the human species.

### 3. The Reproduction of the Human Species Itself

For the reproduction of the material means discussed in the previous section, the main body of the producers is "human beings". As examined in Marx's cognitive framework of social capital reproduction, it has been organically and inherently connected to the reproduction of the "labor force". Then, logically, the reproduction of the labor force should lead to the reproduction of the human species itself, thus expanding naturally from an economic perspective to the perspective of "population science". Engels proposed in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* that based on the "two types of production" thesis of historical materialism: "There are two kinds of production itself. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence, namely food, clothing, housing, and the tools necessary for these; and on the other hand, the production of human beings themselves, i.e., the propagation of the species". [4]

From this perspective, we can recognize the origin of human beings breaking from the general animal kingdom. Combining the basic consensus formed in academic circles, it is known that during the lengthy "prehistoric stage" of at least 2 million years of human existence, the productivity was extremely low, which determined that in addition to the "Homo sapiens" lineage, a large number of other primitive groups of people, as a reproduction of their race, failed to extend down and eventually became extinct (including the famous Zhoukoudian "Chinese apes" - also known as "Beijing apes"). However, due to the special natural and geographical factors in Africa, the reproduction of the Homo sapiens lineage continued without interruption and finally developed "out of Africa" in reproduction and multiplied into today's global family of human societies. The support of human reproduction through the acquisition and production of material resources is proper in the connotation of "two kinds of production", as pointed out by Engels, which have a clear conceptual distinction but closely merge into one and complement each other.

In the vast universe, a unique planet - Earth, a member of the solar system, gave rise to living creatures and animals in the evolution of nature. Eventually, among animal species, humans emerged, which were the most advanced intelligent animals transcending the concept of general

animals. Their basic reproduction mode is sexual reproduction, where the union of males and females produces offspring. The intrinsic relationship between gender relations and anthropology and population science is axiomatic.

When productivity developed to a stage when human society could steadily obtain “surplus products” beyond meeting the survival needs of primitive human groups based on human self-interest, private property ownership emerged, along with patriarchal society (patriarchy) patterns associated with the orderly inheritance of private property. The evolution of family forms from group marriage pairing marriage to monogamy generally represents the progress of human civilization. Issues related to women’s rights have become an iconic perspective for observing the degree of social civilization. However, all these fundamental issues remain the reproduction of the human species within the natural environment of the “global village” of human society in the universe.

The total size of the human population has seen significant increases after the Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions, but these increases have been achieved amidst violent fluctuations. The population size of ancient China, according to the Records of the Three Sovereigns and Five Emperors (authored by Huangfu Mi in the Western Jin Dynasty), was over 1.35 million at the beginning of the Xia Dynasty in the 21st century BC. Subsequent historical records show that in the second year of the Yuanshi Era (2 AD) under the reign of Emperor Ping in the Western Han Dynasty, the national registered population was over 59.59 million. However, the Rebellion of Wang Mang and the wars at the beginning of the Eastern Han Dynasty reduced the population to about 30 million, nearly halving it. By the third year of Yongshou in the late Eastern Han Dynasty (157 AD), it increased to 60 million and then reduced by more than half to about 23 million during the Three Kingdoms period. It was not until the fifth year of Daye in the Sui Dynasty (609 AD) that it recovered to about 60 million. The population peak during the prosperous Tang Dynasty once reached 90 million in 755 AD, then reduced to only about 17 million by the Anshi Rebellion. During the Song Dynasties, the population exceeded 100 million in the fourth year of Daguan (1100 AD). However, it was reduced to about 70 million by the time of the Yuan Dynasty’s unification due to the subsequent wars. By the beginning of the Ming Dynasty, it was less than 60 million. In the late Ming Dynasty, the national population exceeded 200 million but dropped by more than 50% per cent after the Qing Dynasty. By the sixth year of the Qianlong Emperor’s reign (1741 AD), China’s population had only recovered to 130 million. [5]

The size of the population of Europe throughout its history has been relatively flat in terms of change. However, there were significant declines in the period 200-600 AD due to barbarian invasions and the fall of the Roman Empire

(from 27.6 million to 18.6 million) and in the period 1300-1400 due to the Black Death plague (from 58.35 million to 41.5 million).

Observations from this perspective have given rise to an important academic theoretical proposition: the understanding and controversies on Thomas Malthus’s “An Essay on the Principle of Population”. Malthus’s core argument comes from the clear contrast between population growth and the food supply available from natural resources. In his book in 1798, “An Essay on the Principle of Population” [6], he proposed that driven by human appetites and sexual desires, population, if unchecked, would grow geometrically (exponentially) while food supply could only increase arithmetically (with constant increments but decreasing growth rates). Population tends to grow indefinitely, whereas the growth of the means of subsistence is limited. If population growth exceeds food supply, there will be poverty and famine. Therefore, factors such as late marriage, birth control, wars, plagues, and famines could “preventively” or “actively” curb population size.

The debates over Malthus’s core ideas have never ceased. First is the “population theory” versus the “hands theory” debate. The former emphasizes that every person has a mouth to feed (consuming resources). At the same time, the latter highlights that every person has a pair of hands and can work to create an effective supply to solve food (survival) problems. Chairman Mao once said with great vigor, “Among all things in the world, people are the most precious. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, as long as we have people, we can create any human miracles.” [7] However, during Mao’s era, after harshly criticizing Ma Yinchu’s “New Theory of Population” advocating for birth control, China later implemented decades of strict administrative measures to control population growth under the names of “family planning” and the “one-child policy”. The practice, in the process of “testing truth”, has shown at least part of the reasonableness of Malthus’s point of view (which is more applicable to the relatively underdeveloped stage of human society). When combined with the economic principle of diminishing marginal returns in investment, output, and benefits after reaching a critical point, the concept of limited “effective supply” can help understand the specific applicability of Malthus’s population theory.

However, meanwhile, it is crucial to emphasize an important counterargument: technological progress in human society can provide “increasing” or even “step” growth in output and benefits after investment, breaking through the limitations of arithmetic growth in food and resource supply on the supply side. An academic interpretation of Deng Xiaoping’s famous quote, “Science and technology are the primary productive forces”, is that the successful application of scientific and technological achievements does not simply add a fourth element to the

traditional three elements of productivity but multiplies them, creating a multiplier effect. Hence, it is “primary”. [8] This multiplier effect can also be extended to a broader understanding of “total factor productivity,” collectively contributing to a “step” upgrading in satisfying human material demands. [9] Based on this understanding, considering factors such as the decline in fertility intentions with rising development levels, human population growth is influenced not only by “limited” factors but also by “unlimited” or even “multiplier” factors, resulting in remarkable growth in real life: the global population has surged from 2.5 billion in 1950 to 8 billion in 2022 after World War II.

Regarding the general situation in human society and the situation in China after 1949, it is believed that the following points can be briefly commented on based on the correlation between population reproduction and productivity, production relations, institutions, and culture during different stages of human society development.

First, due to technological progress and the evolution of social civilization, basic living materials such as food no longer grow in simple arithmetic progressions. In the case of the population, with the popularization of contraception and the increased participation of women in social activities due to their advancement in status, as well as factors such as the “new wave of the Dinks” and the “middle-class anxiety”, women’s fertility intentions and actual fertility rates have significantly decreased. So, it is not a simple geometric progression and even enters negative growth states. For example, in recent years, China’s fertility rate has rapidly declined to 6.77% in 2024, lower than the death rate of 7.76% that year, resulting in a negative natural population growth rate of -0.99%. [10]

Second, after the 1970s-80s in China, the country implemented the world’s most stringent administrative measures to control the population for nearly four decades. These measures’ characteristics, historical background, and causes can be attributed to at least three factors. First, during the approximately three decades before the late 1970s, the country’s overall development strategy closely followed the Soviet model of “emphasizing heavy industry over light industry”, going even further. This tilting in the layout of the overall industrial structure resulted in shortages of living materials, which was manifested in the implementation of a rigorous and meticulous ticket management system even before the “Three Years’ Hardship Period” caused by the mistakes of the “Great Leap Forward”, otherwise the social life could not go on. The unnatural deaths of the population during the Three Years’ Hardship Period were, in fact, the result of the population control forced by the objective process. Second, in connection with the overly radical cooperative agricultural and people’s commune movements, the enthusiasm of the main body of producers has been seriously dampened from the point of view of relying on agriculture to form the food supply in the sense

of the source of the means of subsistence, creating a situation of pressure in which the leaders of the last century said that the 800 million people were so nervous about getting food to eat. The rigid system of the planned economy in the traditional sense, coupled with the dominance of empty political slogans, has caused much time and energy to be spent on those studies, campaigns, and criticisms of the population, reaching its peak during the “Cultural Revolution”. This resulted in low productivity and an even more tight supply of the means of subsistence. The low-level egalitarianism of the “big pot” system forced nearly 20 million “educated youth” to go to the countryside during the Cultural Revolution, competing with farmers for food. As contradictions accumulated, making the entire system unsustainable, the government had to consider changing its approach, officially adopting “family planning” policies instead of maintaining the authority of the “hands theory” that criticized Ma Yinchu’s “population theory”. The “one-child policy” was strictly enforced for civil servants, with severe penalties like “double expulsion” (expulsion from the Party and public office) for violations. Over several decades, these stringent “family planning” measures in China represented a “unique national condition” at that stage, differing significantly from the general situation in the external world.

Third, when China officially announced the family planning policy, experts estimated a “thirty-year period”. However, with the great liberation of productivity brought about by the reform and opening up, rural reforms in the early 1980s solved the “food problem”, followed by solving the “subsistence” problem for the people. By the early 1990s, a situation of “market sluggishness” emerged, with abundant living materials, leading to the abolition of rationing and a transition to a “buyer’s market” for consumer goods. At this point, the original “thirty-year period” design for family planning should have been adjusted to “fifteen years” or at most “thirty years”. However, due to the “vested interests” of local administrative authorities, these measures were dragged on for over 30 years and then extended for another five years for various pretexts. Even when adjustments were finally made, they were hesitant and too small, leading to obvious social pressures from aging and low fertility rates.

Only in recent years has China half-heartedly shifted towards policies encouraging childbirth. In fact, with the great liberation of productivity after the reform and opening up, China’s population issues have completely changed its reference system. The supply of living materials can now support people having more children and enjoying a better life. This would not only cause the past fears of food shortages but also expand domestic demand, optimize the population structure, and cultivate human capital to support and strengthen the growth momentum.

In summary, comparing the global situation with the evolution process and causes of China’s “family planning”

period, it can be seen that under the proposition of “the reproduction of human society’s species”, the “zigzag” evolution in China’s official implementation orientation occurred against the backdrop of the world development trend surpassed the relatively applicable stage of Malthus’s “population theory”. China experienced substantial human errors in initially suppressing, promoting, and ultimately abandoning the “population theory”. The path selection and changes in China’s population reproduction were accompanied by negative factors in the reproduction of material goods and losses in people’s well-being. However, they eventually aligned with the new development stage of reform and opening up, as well as the new challenges of an aging and low-fertility society, shifting towards encouraging childbirth.

#### **4. The Reproduction of Human Society’s Thoughts and Culture**

Beyond the aforementioned two levels of human society reproduction, there is already an academic framework for “cultural reproduction”, particularly associated with education. The author believes a more comprehensive understanding should be termed “the reproduction of human society’s thoughts and culture”.

What distinguishes humans from the animal kingdom is the possession of thoughts and wisdom — “I think, therefore I am”, “I think, therefore I am human”. The emergence, transmission (including instances of oblivion), and development of human thoughts are intricately linked with humanity’s unique languages and written forms, which serve as information carriers, enabling the intergenerational transmission of knowledge through education. In a certain sense, humans may not appear physically formidable in the natural world compared to some other animals, such as beasts of prey. However, human dignity and our position at the pinnacle of the biological food chain are determined by our thoughts and the “cultural heritage” associated with knowledge, wisdom, and innovation. As the French philosopher Blaise Pascal said, “Man is but a reed, the most fragile thing in nature; but he is a thinking reed... Our entire dignity lies in thoughts.” [11]

Human thoughts, as a specific manifestation of “rational thinking” (distinct from “instinct” and “sensitivity”) and “spirit” (distinct from “materiality”), embody characteristics of “culture”. Regarding the concept of culture, although it has not been possible to form a recognized and precise definition, the general understanding has a spiritual point. The things in society (general and specific) shift from the material level to the spiritual level of fusion and sublimate the meaning.

Different ethnic groups have different cultures (such as Chinese, European, and American cultures), and different areas also have different cultures (such as religious, residential, wine, and porcelain cultures). Thus, we can

enumerate countless different cultural concepts in the world. For the culture, there is no superiority or inferiority, but differences in the characteristics of different objects exclusively.

In contrast, “civilization” emphasizes human commonalities, reflecting a generally recognized evolutionary process from lower to higher degrees of civilization, i.e., the progress of human society. For instance, “modern civilization” inherently implies superiority over past civilizations. Historical examples include the transition from human sacrifice to “terracotta figurine sacrifice” or “material sacrifice” and the evolution of capital punishment methods from “dismemberment by chariots” and “lingchi” to “shooting” and “lethal injection”. When discussing the reproduction (transmission, oblivion, and development) of human thoughts and culture, the most valuable outcome is recognizing human civilization’s continuity and advancement.

Initially, human society relied on language for the reproduction of thoughts and culture. The advent of writing marked the beginning of what is often called “civilized history”, implying that the preceding era could be deemed a “barbaric period”—with the emergence of writing, knowledge and information exchange, and more systematic intergenerational transmission of humanistic education acquired reliable carriers, representing a milestone in the transition from “tradition” to “documentation”. In the long term, the progress of civilization has been evident, yet its specific trajectory has been marked by fluctuations, even drastic ups and downs. The “long and dark Middle Ages” succeeded the revered Western ancient Greek civilization. China’s ancient civilization, which reached its peak during the Song Dynasty, suffered setbacks due to the incursions of relatively less developed nomadic tribes during the Yuan and Qing dynasties, resulting in the destruction of many manifestations of thoughts and culture, including books, cultural relics, architecture, and artworks, which is a partial interruption in this reproductive process. In the transmission of ideological and cultural heritage with modern significance, the important concepts that people respect are freedom, equality, fraternity (or love), the rule of law, democracy and other “common values” of mankind, and the “spirit of independence and freedom of thought” that academics particularly value, and the increasingly recognized concepts, such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and inclusive development. However, these also involve different orientations, conflicts, and struggles related to values, “ideologies”, and even political divisions.

In contemporary society, there is an important concept related to the reproduction (dissemination, transmission, and innovation) of thoughts and culture: the “market for ideas”, which needs to be briefly discussed here. Coase, a famous American economist who was very concerned about and enthusiastically supported China’s reforms, once advised before his death: “Looking back at what China has

achieved in the past thirty years is amazing, and looking forward, the future is bright. However, today's Chinese economy faces an important problem, namely, the lack of a market for ideas, which is the root cause of many of China's economic ills and dangers". If you do not read the original English text, the "market for ideas" will certainly lead to obvious conceptual confusion and disorder in Chinese - the market is a place of "equal exchange", how can ideas be traded and exchanged according to the rules of commodities? Some scholars have attempted to clarify this by stating that ideas in the ideological sense have traditionally been associated with "ideological positions" rather than "markets for ideas". Coase's ideas here should be understood as "thoughts, thinking, ideas" with non-ideological attributes, mainly referring to knowledge, technology and various creative ideas involving the market allocation of intellectual property rights and the elements of the scientific and technological achievements. [12] This explanation is academically sound but somewhat misses the point. Many Chinese scholars who admire Coase's concept of the "market for ideas" emphasize how to achieve the "blossoming of a hundred flowers and a hundred schools of thought" in contemporary Chinese society - a problem with profound influence and typical contradictions. It is often said that "truth stands up to scrutiny" and "science welcomes challenges". Accompanying questioning, critique, debate, and the free expression of diverse viewpoints are inevitable methods and developmental mechanisms for reproducing human thoughts and culture, knowledge transmission, education, and progress in scientific research. The 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China reaffirmed the eight-word "double-hundred policy", but how to correctly and substantively implement it, we have to recognize that we still face all kinds of constraints and entanglements in real life. Historically, after the implementation of the "double-hundred policy" in 1956-57, it led to an excessively expanded "Anti-Rightist Campaign", plunging numerous intellectuals and social elites into suffering, a strategy referred to by leaders as a "trap to lure snakes out of their holes". To this day, how can we reasonably draw the line between the ideological and non-ideological attributes of ideas and views, and how do we grasp the difference in treatment? This problem is still a difficult problem in academic and theoretical discussions, propaganda, education and scientific research. However, the principle is clear in any case: freedom of speech, which has long been enshrined in the Constitution, must be closely linked to the "two-hundred" orientation of freedom of thought and viewpoints. For the central vein of human ideological and cultural reproduction to reflect the progress in civilization, we must fully affirm and follow the process of social progress and firmly implement it.

## 5. Conclusion

As social beings, humans necessarily rely on the integrated or organic combination of the reproduction of

material resources, the reproduction of their species, and the reproduction of thoughts and culture - a "three-dimensional unity" - to achieve the survival and development of the so-called "human society" as a living entity. This broad cognitive framework, in terms of its internal logical relationships, can be considered as self-evident and axiomatic. However, in the previous academic and theoretical discussions in China and abroad, a clear and complete understanding of this framework has not been formed. This paper articulates and generalizes this framework with the term "three-dimensional unity", aiming to grasp the entire mechanism upon which human society relies to sustain itself, distinguish itself from the general animal kingdom, and pursue civilizational progress and public well-being in a more complete, organized and systematic manner. Elaborating on this "grand" topic in a relatively short paper also demonstrates that one can strive to "simplify complex issues" in academic and theoretical research.

The reproduction of human society across these three dimensions and their integrated fusion and combination are all responses to the innate needs of every individual within "humanity" (survival, subsistence, development, enjoyment, as well as spiritual life - knowledge, emotion, reason, and mental activities and research innovations supported by curiosity and exploratory spirit) through practical supply-side outputs (material resources, reproduction of one's lineage, effective supply of thoughts and culture). Needs constitute the prime driving force behind the development of human society, while supply is the domain where all tangible "innovative" activities occur. [13] As long as human beings exist, the reproduction of human society will inevitably interact with this prime driving force and the innovation force that responds to the prime driving force to form a continuous process of reproduction and development.

The continuous development of human society, carrying forward the past and opening up the future, has always contained the yearning and pursuit of humans for a better life and has constantly confronted challenges, conflicts and other coordination issues that need to be overcome and resolved in the reproduction across these three dimensions. The progress of human society and the advancement of civilization have been propelled forward on a rugged path through unrelenting efforts, unpredictable suffering, and inevitable costs of wealth and loss of life for generations. The perpetual existence of individualized and differentiated factors does not negate the existence and paramount significance of common values from the perspective of a "community with a shared future for mankind". On the contrary, it is imperative to rely on these shared values rooted in "humanity" and "humanitarianism" to strive to seek common ground while reserving differences, to resolve conflicts, to manage struggles and conflicts appropriately, and ultimately to achieve inclusive "coexistence, common prosperity, and shared

development”. The “humane” advancement in coordination mechanisms, which are comprehensively constituted by institutional frameworks, cultural traditions, and ideological concepts, will possess enduring value worthy of pursuit.

## References

- [1] Speech at Marx’s Grave, Engels’ Speech at Marx’s Grave. [Online]. Available: <https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E5%9C%A8%E9%A9%AC%E5%85%B%E6%80%9D%E5%A2%93%E5%89%8D%E7%9A%84%E8%AE%B2%E8%AF%9D/9593071>
- [2] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, volume 1, Princeton, 2024. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [3] Jia Kang, *Persistent Exploration in the Transition Era*, China Financial and Economic Publishing House, 2003. [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [4] Marx, Engels, and Lenin, *The Complete Works of Marx and Engels*, vol. 28, People’s Publishing House, 2018. [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [5] Wu Zhongguan et al., *Dictionary of Population Science*, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics Press, 1997. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- [6] Thomas Robert Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population (1978)*, Pickering & Chatto Publishers, 1986. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [7] Mao Zedong, “The Bankruptcy of the Idealist Conception of History,” *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, 1949. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [8] Jia Kang, and Su Jingchun, *New Quality Productivity*, China Translation & Publishing House, 2024. [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [9] Jia Kang, “The Concept, Connotation, and System of New Quality Productive Forces: Promoting ‘Qualitative Change’ through ‘Innovation’,” *Journal of Dongbei University of Finance and Economics*, Issue 4, 2024. ([https://zzs.dufe.edu.cn/zzcmcontent/conid\\_310.html](https://zzs.dufe.edu.cn/zzcmcontent/conid_310.html))
- [10] National Bureau of Statistics of China. [Online]. Available: <https://www.stats.gov.cn/english/index.html>
- [11] Pascal, and He Zhaowu, *Thoughts(Chinese Translation of Famous Works)*, Commercial Press, 1985. [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [12] Zhu Xiangyuan, “The Correct Interpretation on the Meaning of Coase’s ‘Market for Ideas’,” *Beijing Daily*, 2014. [[Publisher Link](#)]
- [13] Jia Kang, *New Supply-side Economics*, Shanxi Economic Publishing House, 2015. [[Publisher Link](#)]